

REMARKS

## Request for Reconsideration

Applicant has carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remains of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the amendments to the claims, the amendments to the specification and the following remarks.

Claim Status

Claims 1-12 are pending in this Application. Claims 1-9 have been allowed while Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected.

Claim 11 has been amended herein to recite that the activated lens reduces the light intensity which reaches the eye and this reduction in light intensity provides a delayed image to that eye. Support for this amendment can be found on the insert to page 25 at lines 1-5, and 23-29. In those passages, it teaches that the activation reduces the light intensity and delays the picture reaching the eye. Thus, no new matter has been added by way of this amendment.

## Rejection

Claims 11 and 12 had been rejected as being unpatentable over Noble. It is the Examiner's position that Noble teaches that one of the lenses becomes cloudy or obscured and, thus, partly blocks light reaching the eye.

Claim 11 has been amended herein to recite that the viewer receives a delayed image to his one eye, thus, the viewer is able to see through both eyes, albeit, that one of the eyes sees an image that is delayed vis-à-vis the other eye.

In Noble, at Column 3, lines 34-35, he teaches that the user is unable to see the displayed image through the eye on which the lens has become cloudy or obscured.

Thus, the difference between Noble and the present Invention is that in the present Invention the light intensity is reduced but allows an image to be seen by the eye. In contrast, when Noble's lens becomes cloudy or obscured, the user is unable to see the image. Thus, in the present Invention, both eyes of the viewer are able to view the image, albeit that it is through different light intensity.

Respectfully, the present Invention is patentable over the teachings of Noble because Noble neither teaches nor suggests allowing both eyes to view the image wherein one eye sees a delayed image because of reduction in light intensity.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should any extensions of time or fees be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donald C. Lucas, 31,275  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
475 Park Avenue South, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel. # 212-661-8000

DCL/mr